

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-16 are rejected. Claims 17-23 were canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-16

The present office action states that Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Huffman et al. (2005/0086397), hereinafter “Huffman” in view of Feldman et al. (2003/0115147), hereinafter “Feldman”.

Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 9) includes the features, “A method for providing a media change notification on a computing system comprising:

polling a media device of a computing system for a media change wherein said polling of said media device cannot be blocked by said computing system;

detecting a media change on said media device;

generating a media change notification when said media change is detected, said media change notification distinct from and operating in parallel with an autorun protocol component of said computing system; and

outputting said media change notification when said media change on said media device is detected wherein said media change notification cannot be blocked by said computing system.” (emphasis added).

Applicants have reviewed Huffman and do not understand Huffman to teach or render obvious the claimed features.

I. Applicants respectfully note that the present Office Action does not show each of the claimed features to be taught by Huffman, but instead, the examination appears to utilize the same features of Huffman as analogous to different features within the claimed subject matter.

A. For example, with respect to the claimed features, “polling a media device of a computing system for a media change wherein said polling of said media device cannot be blocked by said computing system” the Office action cites, “[see (Huffman et al. **Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7)** where Huffman et al. teaches that the polling of the media device for a media change utilizes Direct Memory Access on the host bus with interrupt notification that cannot be blocked]”

B. To show the next feature, “detecting a media change on said media device”, the Office Action cites **the same portion of Huffman** that was relied upon to render obvious completely different Claimed features. i.e., “[see (Huffman et al. **Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4)** where Huffman et al. teaches the detection of a change of the media]”

C. For the next claimed features, “generating a media change notification when said media change is detected, said media change notification distinct from and operating in parallel with an autorun protocol component of said computing system”, the Office Action **again cites the exact same portions** of Huffman that were relied upon to render obvious completely different Claimed features. i.e., “[see (Huffman et al. **Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2)** where Huffman et al. teaches the creation and transmission of a message indicating that a media change has occurred].”

D. Finally, to show the claimed features, “outputting said media change notification when said media change on said media device is detected wherein said media change notification cannot be blocked by said computing system”, the Office **Action once again cites** the exact same portions of Huffman that were relied upon to render obvious completely different Claimed features. i.e., “[see (Huffman et al. **Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7)** where Huffman et al. teaches outputting or transmission of a message indicating that a media change has occurred where the media change notification utilizes Direct Memory Access on the host bus with interrupt notification that cannot be blocked]”.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness not been made for the reason that different claimed features cannot properly be shown by the same portions of a cited reference. In other words, if a portion of reference is shown to render obvious a first feature, it appears less than probable to Applicants that the exact same portion of a reference also shows a distinctly different claimed feature.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Huffman et al. does not teach or render obvious the features recited in independent Claims 1 and 9.

With respect to Feldman, Applicants have reviewed Feldman and do not understand Feldman to overcome the shortcomings of Huffman as described herein.

For this further reasoning, Applicants respectfully submit that Huffman in view of Feldman fails to teach or render obvious the features recited in independent Claims 1 and 9. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claims 1 and 9 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance.

II. With respect to the claimed features, “polling a media device of a computing system for a media change wherein said polling of said media device cannot be blocked by said computing system” the Office action cites, “[see (Huffman et al. **Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7**) where Huffman et al. teaches that the polling of the media device for a media change utilizes Direct Memory Access on the host bus with interrupt notification that cannot be blocked]”

Applicants have reviewed Huffman, including the cited portion and find no teaching of Huffman that states, “Huffman et al. teaches that the polling of the media device for a media change utilizes Direct Memory Access on the host bus with interrupt notification that cannot be blocked.”

Applicants respectfully request the Office Action provide the specific location of the teaching by Huffman or withdraw the rejection as being improper.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Huffman et al. does not teach or render obvious the features recited in independent Claims 1 and 9.

With respect to Feldman, Applicants have reviewed Feldman and do not understand Feldman to overcome the shortcomings of Huffman as described herein.

For this further reasoning, Applicants respectfully submit that Huffman in view of Feldman fails to teach or render obvious the features recited in independent Claims 1 and 9. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claims 1 and 9 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 2-8 and 10-16, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 2-8 and 10-16 depend from allowable independent Claims 1 and 9 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8 and 10-16 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-16 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner Blecher LLP

Date: December 23, 2010

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 377-0500